SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

MINUTES

Meeting of Thursday, January 20, 1994
Room BC-110, 10:00

Present: S. Ali, P. Bird, **T. Bui (Chair),** U. de Brentani, A.B. Ibrahim, P. Lightbown, K. Lipke, E. Loo (recording secretary), D. Markiewicz, J.F. Plamondon, P. Shizgal, C. Suen, K. Thulasiraman, A. Williams

Regrets: J. Wilkinson

Absent: A. Homzy

DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED AND DISTRIBUTED TO SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

SRC-01-20-94-D1	Procedural Guidelines for Periodic Appraisal of Research Centres
SRC-01-20-94-D2	Procedural Guidelines for Periodic Appraisal of Academic Units
SRC-01-20-94-D3	Financial Framework: 1994 to 1999
SRC-01-20-94-D4	Draft of SRC response to the Report of the Task Force on Senate Reform
SRC-01-20-94-D5	Report of the Expert Task Force on the Enhancement of University-Wide Research Support Services and Facilities

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m.

1. Approval of Agenda (SRC-01-20-94-A)

The agenda for the meeting was approved.

2. Approval of Minutes

The Minutes for the meeting of November and December were not ready.

3. Business arising from Minutes

None.

4. Report of the Chair

None.

5. Report of the Director, Office of Research Services

A. Williams reported the following:

1) The Newsletter with all the awards will be out in a few days, instead of having two quarterly newsletter, they have combined the two together.

2) There is a number of workshops and seminars being planned: the NSERC Strategic workshop will be early in March and CQRS workshop late in Spring.

3) ILO is organising a seminar on "How to set-up contracts", late in Spring.

4) For the first time, we have received a cooperative scientific international award for teams already in existence to encourage international collaboration and it is Dr. G. Joos in Engineering for scientific project with France/Québec.

5) The deadline date to submit letters for the NSERC Special Collaborative Project is January 14th. The letters are to be sent directly to NSERC, we have received over a hundred requests for letters of intent but we have no idea how many have been sent out.

6. Question Period

None

7. a) Procedural Guidelines for Periodic Appraisal of Research Centres (SRC-01-20-94-D2)

Chair noted that he is in the process of asking the Directors of Research Centres which are approved by Senate and Board of Governors in both the Faculty of Engineering & Computer Science and the Faculty Arts & Science to submit a 5-year progress report to SRC via their Faculty Council. This is along the procedures and guidelines of the Senate document on evaluation of research centres (US-89-2-D4). For all other research centres of the university, this document proposes to channel the evaluation process through the academic appraisal procedure approved by Senate last year. He intends to set-up a small ad-hoc committee to look at the 5-year progress reports of these university approved research centres. The main problem is with centres approved by departments or faculties or by units. It was suggested that copies of documents US-89-2-D4 and US-90-10-D19 be sent out to members of the SRC.

Chair noted that Appendix 1 of SRC-01-20-94-D1 is not complete, he would like to have a list consisting of centres approved by University Senate and Board of Governors and Centres created and approved by departments, units or faculties.

It was proposed that in the document we should stipulate that by January 1995 only centres that have been approved by Senate and Board of Governors will be recognised.

It was remarked that presumably the non-research centres will not fall under the SRC mandate.

Chair proposed that all centres should go through the appraisal process because when we say research centres the definition is unclear. In certain circumstances it is a small component of research which exists in a centre.

D. Markiewicz agreed with the notion of the integration into the periodic appraisal, the issue of ensuring that the centre is properly appraised. One aspect of danger of the appraisal system is that the Appraisal Committees are asked to examine a lot of issues at the same time, they are not able to look at them carefully, certain cases will be appraised properly and adequately whereas others will not. We should try certain mechanism to ensure that SRC maintains its responsibility.

C. Suen proposed that may be we should look at what the Centre proposed at the beginning, the financial responsibility and resources required including personnel and see what they have now and see how they matched from what they proposed.

7 b) Financial Framework: 1994 to 1999 (SRC-01-20-94-D3)

Chair noted that since December the Budget Committee has met a number of times, the urgency of the matter for 1994-1995. There is a forceable cut in the budget of the university. There has been a number of suggestions and discussions including a proposal for a 10% cut in all units. Other suggestions include: increase workload or combine sections of courses, eliminate LTA or use it differently. The Financial Framework document was sent by Steering Committee of Senate and to SRC for comments.

7 **b) Financial Framework: 1994 to 1999 (SRC-01-20-94-D3)**

It was noted that some classes are already crowded and that it is impossible to combine classes. Chair remarked that they are looking at the possibility of larger classrooms.

J.F. Plamondon asked whether there has been serious consideration given to rationalising operation between universities, like share facilities, share resources in terms of journals so as to cut down on costs, to make a most efficient use of resources between us and McGill for example.

P. Shizgal noted that there is already a Quebec inter-library programme, any university student can borrow materials from other universities and there is always collaboration between libraries.

Chair noted that there is a proposal of appraising all services in the non-academic side of the University to find out where there is a possible cut.

S. Ali noted that there exists a collaboration between departments in different universities, ISM is one of them, it has been in existence over a year now and it rationalises the four universities and École Polytechnique in mathematics. The lists of courses offered at all the universities at the graduate level are circulated among all departments and students at one university can work with professors of other university.

U. de Brentani suggested that we could shift to the trimester system, because in the summer we have all the different resources sitting around not being used and in winter these classes are overcrowded, students are sitting on the floor. We should offer more courses in Summer and encourage students to take them.

7 **c) Report of the Task Force on Senate Reform (SRC-10-21-93-D1)**

Chair stated that Dr. P. Lightbown with the help of Drs. D. Markiewicz and P. Shizgal has drafted a summary of the discussions that entailed at the last SRC Meeting and asked Committee Members if they have any comments.

No comments.

7 **d) Proposal University Code of Ethics**

Chair informed Committee Members that the mandate of the Code of Ethics Committee is to consult with the university community and come up with the recommendations and changes to the document. The Code of Ethics Committee has met with a number of people including Suzanne Belson and Beatrice Pearson from Ombuds Office, this week with Dr. June Chaikelson, President of CUFA, next week with Audrey Williams and Marie-André Robitaille. The committee decided to send this document to a selective group of people and there will be a public hearing in March or April.

7 d) Proposal University Code of Ethics

It was remarked that in the preamble there are basic principles that are addressed and that are not followed-up in the document. Chapter 2, item 7 is not clear.

Chair remarked that this was brought up by members of the Committee and by people who appeared before the committee. Chair clarified that graduate students who are paid from faculty member's research grants to work on a thesis with the faculty member as their supervisor are not allowed to work in companies owned by the same Faculty member.

Chapter 3, we must not mix competence and ethics, for example page 8, under Preamble, the last paragraph deals with in competence rather that ethical issues. Page 9 procedure (c) deals with an issue of competence rather that ethics.

Chairs commented that the preamble tries to distinguish between competence and misconduct, we want to say clearly there is a difference between the two.

J.F. Plamondon remarked that he thinks that these clauses are very important, they have to be there for certain faculties where research are done on biology, genetics, anything that can be extremely controversial and which the conclusions may lead to other conclusion or practical applications. It is important that the University has a moral responsibility at least to ensure that the research that comes out was done to professional standard, if not the University is lacking its commitment to integrity.

P. Bird assumed that these clauses are there if somebody in scientific laboratory does not behave in a responsible way, for example does not properly handle radioactive materials.

9. Adjournment

It was moved and seconded (A.B. Ibrahim and J.F Plamondon) that the meeting be adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

file:...\src\minute93.94\jan-20.093